

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Claims 16-20 have been added. The claim amendments and new claims are fully supported by the application as filed and do not present new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW**

Applicants' representative, Brent G. Seitz, thanks Supervisory Examiner Benny Tieu and Examiner Martin Mushambo for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview of February 23, 2010. During the interview, differences between the prior art and the claims were discussed.

The March 4, 2010 Interview Summary issued by the Examiners states that "It seems to the examiner that the proposed amendment to claim 1 can overcome the rejection in first [sic] office action based on Yoshimura. Final confirmation of this conclusion will require further consideration." During the interview, however, the Examiners stated that *original* Claim 1 is likely not anticipated by the Yoshimura et al. reference (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0171868) because it fails to disclose or suggest displaying a print image, as substantially set forth in independent Claims 1 and 15. Amended Claims 1 and 15 set forth herein include amendments that were not discussed during the Interview. Applicants do not believe that these amendments are necessary to distinguish Yoshimura et al., but are presenting them to expedite prosecution of this application.

During the interview, the Examiners stated that U.S. Publication No. 2003/0184805 to Kurokawa et al. may be relevant. Applicants request that the Examiners cite this reference in PTO Form 892 in the next Office Action to make this reference of record.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-5 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshimura, et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0171868). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent Claim 1 recites, in part and with reference to Figures 1-3 for exemplary purposes only, “a print-image creating section [60] creating a print image to be printed on the printer from the designated print data; a print-image displaying section [40] displaying the print image of the designated print data on a display panel [41]; and a data-outputting section [20] transferring the designated print data to the printer according to an instruction for printing the designated print data after the print image of the designated print data is visually identified.

Amended Claim 15 recites, in part and with reference to Figures 1-3 for exemplary purposes only, “wherein the print buffer unit creates a print image from the data and displays the print image on the display panel [41].”

The Yoshimura et al. reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figure 2, a print server. As illustrated in Figure 9 and paragraph [0118], the print server 100 includes a job producing section 107 that is operable to produce a sample print job. Parameters for the sample print job are set using a print instruction screen 120 (Figure 10, [0120]). The screen 120 is not operable to display an image to be printed. The

Yoshimura et al. reference fails to disclose displaying an image on a screen prior to the image being printed.

The Office Action cites paragraph [0120] as allegedly disclosing display of a print image, but this paragraph simply discloses a “sample printing operation” for actually printing on paper a sample that is controlled via “a print instruction initial screen 120.” The Office Action further cites paragraph [0151], but this paragraph describes the “job producing section 107,” which produces actual paper print jobs, not a print image to be displayed on a screen.

During the interview the Examiners cited paragraph [0135], which states “The user considers the displayed printed results of the sample printing operation, and then, may again set the information about the previously-instructed sample printing operation.” The Examiners asserted that “displayed” refers to a sample print displayed on a screen. To the contrary, “displayed” refers to actual “printed results,” as confirmed by the next sentence which states “For instance, when the user judges that a printed result obtained from a specific printer is not a desirable printed result, the user may delete the specific printer from the output destination printer information....” Thus, the Yoshimura et al. reference is referring to the use of actual sample prints to test different printers, not the display of a print image on a screen, which would make it impossible to test different printers.

The Yoshimura et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest “a print-image displaying section displaying the print image of the designated print data on a display panel,” as set forth in amended independent Claim 1. Yoshimura et al. also fails to disclose or suggest “wherein the print buffer unit creates a print image from the data

and displays the print image on the display panel,” as set forth in independent Claim 15. Therefore, the Yoshimura et al. reference fails to anticipate each and every feature of independent Claims 1 and 15. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 102 rejection of independent Claims 1 and 15, as well as those claims dependent therefrom.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 6-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimura et al. in view of Wang (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0243826). Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshimura et al. in view of Tyler et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,638,498). Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshimura and Wang, in view of Tyler et al. Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshimura in view of Applicants’ Admitted Prior Art at page 1, lines 15-16 of the specification. Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshimura and Wang, as modified with Tyler in view of Applicants’ Admitted Prior Art. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 6-14 are dependent on amended independent Claim 1. Thus, dependent Claims 6-14 are not anticipated or obvious at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 103 rejection of Claims 6-14.

### **NEW CLAIMS**

New claims 16-20 have been added. The new claims are fully supported by the application as filed and do not present new subject matter. For example, support for the new claims can be found in Figures 1-3 and pages 5-11 of the application as filed. New Claim 16 recites numerous features that are not anticipated or obvious in light of the art of record. For example, the art of record fails to disclose or suggest a print buffer unit including the following claim features: "an operation switch configured to receive print buffer operational instructions input by a user of the print buffer unit;" "a print-image creating section;" "a print-image displaying section;" "a display panel included with the print image displaying section configured to display the print image;" "a modification-inputting section;" "a modification pad configured to receive inputs from a user for modifying the print image;" and "a battery operable to power the entire print buffer unit."

Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of new independent Claim 16 and Claims 17-20 dependent therefrom.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 16, 2010

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/BGS

15343158.1

By: /Bryant E. Wade/  
G. Gregory Schivley  
Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade  
Reg. No. 40,344